

Serial No. 09/760,924
Page 17 of 20

- 12 luminance value of a pixel below of the missing pixel and in the second prior field f_{-2}
13 relative to the field f_0 including the missing pixel.

1 50. (original) The method as defined in claim 49 wherein said step of generating a motion
2 metric value includes a step of generating said motion metric value in accordance with
3 $\Delta = \max(\Delta_c, \min(\Delta_n, \Delta_s))$, where Δ is said motion metric value.

R e m a r k s

Claims 1, 2, 4-18, 20-27, 29-43 and 45-50 are pending in the application.

Claims 1-2, 4-18, 20-27, 29-43 and 45-50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. patent 4,989,090 issued to Campbell on January 29, 1991 in view of U.S. Patent 6,037,986 issued to Kawada on December 16, 1997 and U.S. Patent 6,037,986 issued to Zhang on March 14, 2000.

Each of the various rejections and objections are overcome by amendments that are made to the specification, drawing, and/or claims, as well as, or in the alternative, by various arguments that are presented.

Entry of this Amendment is proper under 37 CFR § 1.116 since the amendment: (a) places the application in condition for allowance for the reasons discussed herein; (b) does not raise any new issue requiring further search and/or consideration since the amendments amplify issues previously discussed throughout prosecution; (c) satisfies a requirement of form asserted in the previous Office Action; (d) does not present any additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims; or (e) places the application in better form for appeal, should an appeal be necessary. The amendment is necessary and was not earlier presented because it is made in amendment to arguments raised in the final rejection. Entry of the amendment is thus respectfully requested.

Any amendments to any claim for reasons other than as expressly recited herein as being for the purpose of distinguishing such claim from known prior art are not being made with an intent to change in any way the literal scope of such claims or the range of equivalents for such claims. They are being made simply to present language that is better in conformance with the form requirements of Title 35 of the United States Code or is simply clearer and easier to understand than the originally presented language. Any amendments to

Serial No. 09/760,924

Page 18 of 20

any claim expressly made in order to distinguish such claim from known prior art are being made only with an intent to change the literal scope of such claim in the most minimal way, i.e., to just avoid the prior art in a way that leaves the claim novel and not obvious in view of the cited prior art, and no equivalent of any subject matter remaining in the claim is intended to be surrendered.

Also, since a dependent claim inherently includes the recitations of the claim or chain of claims from which it depends, it is submitted that the scope and content of any dependent claims that have been herein rewritten in independent form is exactly the same as the scope and content of those claims prior to having been rewritten in independent form. That is, although by convention such rewritten claims are labeled herein as having been "amended," it is submitted that only the format, and not the content, of these claims has been changed. This is true whether a dependent claim has been rewritten to expressly include the limitations of those claims on which it formerly depended or whether an independent claim has been rewritten to include the limitations of claims that previously depended from it. Thus, by such rewriting no equivalent of any subject matter of the original dependent claim is intended to be surrendered. If the Examiner is of a different view, he is respectfully requested to so indicate.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

Claims 1-2, 4-18, 20-27, 29-43 and 45-50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. patent 4,989,090 issued to Campbell on January 29, 1991 in view of U.S. Patent 6,037,986 issued to Kawada on December 16, 1997 and U.S. Patent 6,037,986 issued to Zhang on March 14, 2000.

Applicants thank the Examiner for a well-reasoned Office Action. However, Applicants must continue to disagree on several points as previously noted, and as discussed additionally below. Thus, in addition to the below comments, the Examiner is respectfully directed to Applicants' comments and arguments in the previous Office Action responses.

Applicants respectfully avoid this ground of rejection for the following reasons.

In the present Office Action, "temporal median filter interpolator 22" of figure 2 of the Campbell reference is equated to the claimed "frame interpolator." Applicants respectfully disagree. A frame-based interpolator, such as claimed in claim 1, utilizes the information from two entire frames to interpolate image information. Temporal median filter

Serial No. 09/760,924

Page 19 of 20

interpolator 22 of Campbell uses information from three successive fields (i.e., three of the four fields that would otherwise represent two frames). The three fields are a present field (F1), a preceding field (F2) and a following field (F0). It is noted that the present field (F1) information comprises the average intensity level of the two most proximate pixels. For each pixel processed in this manner, the median pixel provided by the three fields is output from the interpolator 22. Thus, the temporal median filter interpolator 22 of Campbell merely provides a field-based interpolation to select an intermediate pixel, rather than a frame-based interpolation as claimed.

In the present Office Action, "intra-field interpolator 28" of figure 2 of the Campbell reference is equated to the claimed "field interpolator." The intra-field interpolator 28 merely interpolates a pixel value using data within one field (i.e., the intra-field interpolator 28 comprises a spatial filter operative within a single field).

The teaching deficiencies noted above (and in prior Office Action responses) are not supplied by either the Kawada or Zhang references. Thus, claims 1-2, 4-18, 20-27, 29-43 and 45-50 are allowable over Campbell in view of Kawada and Zhang under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Serial No. 09/760,924
Page 20 of 20

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

OCT 04 2006

CONCLUSION

Thus, Applicants submit that all claims now pending are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, both reconsideration of this application and its swift passage to issue are earnestly solicited.

If, however, the Examiner believes that there are any unresolved issues requiring adverse final action in any of the claims now pending in the application, it is requested that the Examiner telephone Eamon J. Wall at (732) 530-9404 so that appropriate arrangements can be made for resolving such issues as expeditiously as possible.

Respectfully submitted,

10/4/06

Eamon J. Wall

Eamon J. Wall, Attorney
Reg. No. 39,414
(732) 530-9404

Patterson & Sheridan, LLP
Attorneys at Law
595 Shrewsbury Avenue, Suite 100
Shrewsbury, New Jersey 07702